1	IN THE UN	NITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR	THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERI	
4	Plaintiff,	
5	vs.) Las Vegas, Nevada) April 7, 2023
6	MATTHEW WADE BEASLEY,) Courtroom 3D)
7	Defendant) Recording method: t.) Liberty/CRD
8) 2:59 p.m 3:48 p.m.
9		4:21 p.m 4:24 p.m. DETENTION HEARING
10		CERTIFIED COPY
11	TRAN	NSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
12	_	HE HONORABLE CAM FERENBACH DISTRICT COURT MAGISTRATE JUDGE
13		
14	APPEARANCES:	
15	For the Government: 1	DANIEL SCHIESS, AUSA
16		ERIC C. SCHMALE, AUSA UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
17		501 Las Vegas Boulevard South, Suite 1100 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
18		(702) 388-6336
19	(Appearances continued	d on nago 2)
20	Recorded by:	Tawnee Renfro
21		Amber M. McClane, RPR, CRR, CCR #914 United States District Court
22		333 Las Vegas Boulevard South, Room 1334 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
23		(702) 384-0429 or AM@nvd.uscourts.gov
24		oy electronic sound recording.
25	rranscript produced by	y mechanical stenography and computer.

1	APPEARANCES CONTINUED:
2	For the Defendant:
3	<i>JACQUELINE M. TIRINNANZI, ESQ.</i> TIRINNANZI LAW PLLC
4	2370 Corporate Circle, Suite 190
5	Henderson, Nevada 89074 (702) 912-3834
6	Also Present:
7	Emily McKillip, Pretrial Services
8	Vanessa Montes, Pretrial Services
9	
10	* * * *
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA; FRIDAY, APRIL 7, 2023; 2:59 P.M. 1 2 --000--PROCEEDINGS 3 4 COURTROOM ADMINISTRATOR: This is the time set for 5 the detention hearing in Case 2:23-cr-66-JAD-DJA, United 6 States of America versus Matthew Wade Beasley. 7 Counsel, please enter your appearance for the record 8 beginning with the Government. MR. SCHIESS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Daniel 9 10 Schiess and Eric Schmale on behalf of the United States. THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Schiess and Mr. Schmale. 11 12 Thank you. 13 MS. TIRINNANZI: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jacqueline Tirinnanzi on behalf of Defendant Matthew Beasley. 14 15 THE COURT: Ms. Tirinnanzi. Thank you. And 16 Mr. Beasley. 17 Okay. So last week Judge Youchah held the initial 18 appearance in this indictment, and it got all the way up to 19 the hearing on pretrial release. The Government apparently 2.0 sought detention. Defense asked for a five-day continuance 21 allowed under the act, so it was granted. So we're here at 22 this point. 23 So I guess I'll just start there. Mr. Schiess or 24 Mr. Schmale, what's the Government's position on pretrial 25 release?

1	MR. SCHIESS: Your Honor, we're seeking detention
2	under § 3142(f)(2).
3	THE COURT: (f) (2)?
4	MR. SCHIESS: Yes.
5	THE COURT: Serious risk of flight?
6	MR. SCHIESS: Yes.
7	THE COURT: Okay.
8	MR. SCHIESS: And then once we establish that, then
9	we will argue we beat that threshold, we'll argue also
10	argue risk of danger to the community.
11	THE COURT: I understand. Okay. Are you ready to
12	proceed?
13	MR. SCHIESS: Yes, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: Okay. And then, Ms. Tirinnanzi, are you
15	ready to proceed?
16	MS. TIRINNANZI: Yes, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: All right. I'll hear from the Government
18	first, please.
19	MR. SCHIESS: Your Honor, may I use the lectern?
20	THE COURT: Please.
21	MR. SCHIESS: Thank you.
22	Thirteen months just about thirteen months ago
23	Mr. Beasley answered the door at his house when three FBI
24	agents approached to interview him. He answered with a gun in
25	his hand and quickly moved it to his head. When the FBI

2.0

TRANSCRIBED FROM DIGITAL RECORDING 2:23-cr-00066-JAD-DJA • 4/7/2023

agents ordered him to drop the gun, he moved the gun in a sweeping motion towards the agents, and he was shot twice to -- for the agents' self-defense. That injury caused him to go back into the house where he barricaded himself for the next four hours.

During that next four hours, he was interviewed -- I shouldn't say interviewed. An FBI crisis -- crisis negotiator spoke with him over the phone to try and get him to put down the gun, to come out of the house. During those four hour -- that four-hour period, Mr. Beasley made several statements, some of which I'm -- will read to the Court not necessarily in the order in which he made them in the four hours.

"I am not coming out. I am not coming out. When I come out, I'll be dead. I'm going to put it" -- referring to the gun -- "on my forehead in a second. I am not going to prison. I am not going to jail. I'm thinking I need to get the balls to effin pull the trigger." And he explained why he said that. He said, quote, "I was running a Ponzi scheme. I'm telling you, I'm guilty. I'll be in jail forever because of what I've done. There's nothing for me when I come out. There's nothing for me. The humility" -- which I think he meant -- meant to say, but humiliation -- "to my family. If I go to jail, they'll have nothing."

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
Amber McClane, RPR, CRR, CCR #914

They'd been tipped off just earlier that morning. He'd been

Your Honor, Mr. Beasley knew that the FBI was coming.

2.0

TRANSCRIBED FROM DIGITAL RECORDING 2:23-cr-00066-JAD-DJA • 4/7/2023

tipped off by individuals who were working, associating with him in the Ponzi scheme, whose houses that morning were being searched by the FBI. Except for Mr. Beasley, he knew that the end was coming. He knew that his -- a Ponzi scheme always ends in collapse, and he was only surprised, as he told the negotiator, that it lasted that long. It lasted five years.

He told the negotiators that he had thought of ending his life earlier by suicide. He said that he had written a letter to his wife and to the FBI and that it was in his house. Your Honor, it took the FBI with the SWAT team four hours to get him out. And it was the SWAT team that had to go in and get him and bring him out.

He was taken to the hospital where he was treated, and a couple days later he was released. From the hospital, he was taken into custody. And as the Court knows from the court record, that on March the 8th, 2022, he had a detention hearing in front of Judge Youchah. Arguments were made from both sides, and Judge Youchah did not hesitate to detain the defendant as both a risk of flight and a risk of danger to any person in the community.

At the time he was charged by complaint with assault on a federal officer, one count of assault on a federal officer. Recently, which is the reason we're here before the Court, he was indicted by the grand jury on several counts of wire fraud and on money laundering.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

TRANSCRIBED FROM DIGITAL RECORDING 2:23-cr-00066-JAD-DJA • 4/7/2023

Soon after the indictment was handed down, we and the Government, moved to dismiss the assault on the federal officer charge. Nonetheless, as we're here 13 months later, the considerations that justified Judge Youchah in detaining the defendant remain the same. Or at least if they changed, they have not changed to Mr. Beasley's benefit but only to his detriment. And so let me review some of those considerations in the context of § 3142, the factors that I need to establish for the Court. And I won't necessarily take the factors in the way they're listed in the statute, but I will cover them. So Number 1, the nature and seriousness of the danger to any person that would be posed by his release. As I've said, this is a situation where the defendant had threatened suicide, had taken steps towards suicide, and in his mind saw suicide as the only way out of the terrible situation that he created for himself and for many, many other people. Now, this was his suicide inclination and his --THE COURT: Ideation I think they say. MR. SCHIESS: -- ideation. I just --THE COURT: Yeah, that's what they -- yeah, that's what the --MR. SCHIESS: I was about to say that, and my tongue got twisted. THE COURT: I understand.

> UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT Amber McClane, RPR, CRR, CCR #914

Okay.

2.0

TRANSCRIBED FROM DIGITAL RECORDING 2:23-cr-00066-JAD-DJA • 4/7/2023

MR. SCHIESS: So on his suicide ideation, that wasn't a one-off where he decided just to go down that road on March the 4th, 2022, when the FBI came there. He admitted that he had been contemplating that for a while, that he saw that as the only way out of the Ponzi scheme that he had created.

He knew then and he knows today that he faces a very long jail sentence. The amount of money that was involved that investors invested into his scheme was just short of \$500 million. In other words, as he knows, this is nearly a half a billion dollar Ponzi that ran for five years that involved more than a thousand individual victims and that occurred while he was using his law license to be able to carry out the scheme. He recognizes the severity of what he's done. He's told the FBI that he felt humiliated, that he was ashamed of what he'd been doing, and he feels like, by his own statement, that he doesn't have hope, he doesn't have a life given the very long sentence that he faces, plus the nature of what he's done even if he comes out, the shame and the humiliation of where he's been.

In that context, Your Honor, he presents -- because those motivations, those feelings, the circumstances haven't changed. So he still presents the very serious risk of danger to himself and to others. And I remind the Court, when I'm talking about others, he put law enforcement in a very dangerous situation. Although that is their job to go into

2.0

TRANSCRIBED FROM DIGITAL RECORDING 2:23-cr-00066-JAD-DJA • 4/7/2023

those situations, people don't have to do that to them. We don't have to try the agents to see if they're capable of fulfilling their duty.

There's nothing to suggest that, if Mr. Beasley is out, he doesn't fail, and the law enforcement has to go out again and get him, that with his total circumstances that he's not going to be [indiscernible] in the same way.

Now, Number 2, the nature and circumstances of the offense. As I just said, this case involves just under \$500 million in loss. Just under a half a billion. It is one of the most serious Ponzi schemes that have occurred in the history of this country based on the loss amount. As I said, it involves more than a thousand victims. He committed this crime while he was acting in his role as an attorney.

Now, he told the FBI that he got into the scheme, he started it because he was severely in debt from gambling; that the person to whom he was in debt was threatening him and putting him in an awful situation. But nonetheless, whatever his reason for it is, his gambling addiction, his gambling problems still is a factor to be considered.

Now, with respect to whether he has financial means to be released or not, the Court probably is well aware that Judge Silva, who's handling a civil case where the SEC has brought civil action, a receiver has been appointed, and we consolidated our efforts between the criminal side and the

2.0

TRANSCRIBED FROM DIGITAL RECORDING 2:23-cr-00066-JAD-DJA • 4/7/2023

civil side to let the SEC receiver try and collect all the assets.

We spoke with the receiver. The FBI and I and Mr. Schmale spoke with them last week, and they've been able to do a very thorough financial analysis as well as the FBI has been able to conduct a very thorough financial analysis.

Based upon both parties' assessment of the nearly \$500 million that was taken, by the time money is accounted for, there was a return to the victims, that the defendant by his own admission paid off his gambling person, money that went to other people in the scheme who lived a luxurious lifestyle, there's still about \$7- to \$10 million missing, unaccounted for.

The receiver, when we asked, do you have everything for Mr. Beasley in terms of assets, he told us you don't know what you don't know. We just know that there's \$7- to \$10,000 [sic] that they can't -- or \$7- to \$10 million that they cannot account for at this time. So that's part of the nature and circumstances of this offense that still needs to be taken into account.

In terms of the sentence that he's facing,

Mr. Beasley's facing a statutory maximum of 160 years. The

sentencing guidelines, when worked all the way through, put

him at an offense level 47, which is life. And even if he

were to plead to receive acceptance of responsibility with no

2.0

TRANSCRIBED FROM DIGITAL RECORDING 2:23-cr-00066-JAD-DJA • 4/7/2023

other variances or downward departure, he's facing about 30 years in prison. He's 50 years old, and that combination of his age and the number of years in prison is what's affecting him emotionally. He knows that, if he gets out, he'll be a very old man. He knows that he will be. As he was talking with the agents and with other situations, he knows that he's going to miss his four kids' lives and them growing up. He's already, since he's been in jail, missed the wedding of his daughter. He won't have any family around, and that concerns him.

Now, why is all of that important? It is important because all of those emotional factors still drive the suicide mind-set or the suicide situation that's going on.

Let me move now to Number 3, to the weight of the evidence. In summary, Your Honor, this is an overwhelming case from an evidentiary standpoint. There are more than a thousand victims who essentially -- and many of them have been interviewed -- who tell the same story about how the scheme operated. And the FBI [indiscernible] agent and talked with people that were working with Mr. Beasley, all talked about how the scheme worked. And essentially Mr. Beasley had promised people directly [indiscernible] to people who are promoting the scheme that they could invest in litigation settlement fundings. In other words, slip-and-fall victims had been hurt. They had actually settled according to the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

TRANSCRIBED FROM DIGITAL RECORDING 2:23-cr-00066-JAD-DJA • 4/7/2023

scam, the story. The insurance litigation, they were just simply waiting for the insurance companies to pay.

Mr. Beasley's plan and the way he conducted this for five years was that he had the victims send the money to his IOLTA account. And he purportedly sent the money from his IOLTA account to these nonexisting slip-and-fall clients through their attorneys, except the FBI has done a very thorough analysis, financial analysis. Not a single penny went from his bank account, his IOLTA account, to any fictitious attorney. Some of these attorneys were real; the clients were fictitious. And not a single penny came back in. Instead, the financial analysis shows that the bank account was just churning money coming in, money going out to victims in terms of interest. Money coming in, going out to the people who were working with him to live an incredibly opulent lifestyle. Luxury homes. Many, many luxury cars. Mr. Beasley was even part owner on a private jet that he was buying with the proceeds of the crime. So he was living a very high lifestyle.

So in terms of the evidence, we can clearly show that it was a Ponzi.

But on top of all of that, but which we really don't need to rely upon but we will if we need to, is that he confessed. He confessed to the agents and said that over and over and over again to the crisis negotiator that he engaged

in a Ponzi scheme.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

The last area is the history and characteristics of the defendant. Talked about his suicide ideation. Now, in relying upon the Pretrial Services report, it also discusses his family ties. He's now divorced. He was divorced just a few days after his barricading himself into the house. He has parents who are here. He has children, but interesting -- and I think important to consider -- is that in the revised or the amended supplemented Pretrial Services report, it says nothing about him having a relationship with his children, being able to maintain a relationship to carry on. He has no --

THE COURT: You're talking about -- you're talking about the report dated March 31st; right?

MR. SCHIESS: Of this year.

THE COURT: Yeah, this year. Yeah.

MR. SCHIESS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And you've seen that, Ms. Tirinnanzi?

MS. TIRINNANZI: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. SCHIESS: He has no job, no [indiscernible], no law license. It's suspended. He says if he got out he can get a job possibly in a steakhouse or construction. And he can live with his parents.

But, look, in terms of his characteristics, in terms of his mind-set and his concerns, if he were to be released

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

TRANSCRIBED FROM DIGITAL RECORDING 2:23-cr-00066-JAD-DJA • 4/7/2023

and then sentenced to an awful long sentence, he would have no incentive to surrender. He doesn't believe that he has a life. He thinks it's over. Believes that, if he goes to prison with a long prison sentence, that's the end of it for him, the end of the road.

Now, Pretrial Services, in the March 31st supplement, has recommended pretrial release except there's something different between the supplement of March 31st and the original of March the 8th, 2022. And the difference is this, and this is based upon our discussion with Pretrial Services and mine particularly with the supervising officer there. What's the difference? And their response to me was -supervising [indiscernible] was recently it was brought to their attention that in drafting and making recommendations Pretrial Services was advised by the general counsel for Pretrial Service out of Washington, D.C., not to include any assessment or recommendation based upon the nature and circumstances of the crime. Well [indiscernible] what that's basically doing is saying, if you're charged with a white-collar crime and we're not going to look at the circumstances, then all white-collar crimes are the same in terms of the Pretrial Services assessment. And there's something missing on that.

THE COURT: Well -- and I don't think that's anything new. I mean, you know, the Pretrial Services report, their

main focus is on the element, history and characteristics of the defendant, and they make their recommendation based on that. It's up to me to take into account -- at least that's the way I do it. I'll just explain it on the record. Nature and circumstances of the offense, weight of the evidence, was he subject to release -- you know, supervision at the time of the crime?

You know, so -- so -- so I look at history and characteristics of the defendant. That's what -- they're making the recommendation on that. They're not telling me how to do my job.

MR. SCHIESS: Okay.

2.0

THE COURT: They're just giving me a recommendation on that element.

MR. SCHIESS: Well, I'm glad I understand that from the Court. Because when the original presentence report was written a year ago, they also based it upon the nature and circumstances of the underlying offense. And that's the difference between their recommendation then and their recommendation now. I just wanted to point that out to the Court.

THE COURT: All right. Well -- and that's -- and that does happen because there's always an overlap or there can be between danger to the community analysis, you know, danger to the community analysis and what the charged crime is

2.0

much has changed.

TRANSCRIBED FROM DIGITAL RECORDING 2:23-cr-00066-JAD-DJA • 4/7/2023

or the conduct in connection with the charged crime. Even
though the person's presumed innocent, the fact -- that those
are facts that I can consider. And so, you know, that -- that
does -- you know -
MR. SCHIESS: Yes.

THE COURT: It's a complicated process.

MR. SCHIESS: I think we're on the same page,
Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Okay.

MR. SCHIESS: We're at the same page. I just wanted
to -- I'm glad to hear that from the Court. I just wanted to
explain why there was a difference in the recommendation from
Pretrial Services between a year ago and today. Because not

Look, today he's facing now that charge that he didn't want to face, and that is the very long sentence under -- or the wire fraud and the Ponzi scheme, which now kicks in the very long sentence. The assault on the federal officer charge that he was facing, as you know, the guidelines makes those high, but they're not nearly as high as what happened in this case.

Now, even though this is a fraud case and a Ponzi scheme, the conduct that occurred in his house on March the 4th, the suicide, all the circumstances, all of the events are underlying factors for this charge. And so I just want to

1 point that out. 2 THE COURT: Well, they're not -- I don't know --3 well, I don't know. I don't want to get into your charging, 4 but it's common -- and, Mr. Schiess, you know, you're not over 5 here doing these that often. Okay? But when somebody, you 6 know, runs away, when they stop the car, and things of that --7 I hear all that. That's got nothing to do with the crime, but 8 what happens with the interaction with law enforcement is 9 something that's fair to be considered. It can be argued on 10 both sides. 11 MR. SCHIESS: And that's what I'm arguing. And 12 that's --13 THE COURT: Yeah. I got it. MR. SCHIESS: -- why I'm pointing it out with you. 14 15 THE COURT: Okay. I got it. 16 MR. SCHIESS: Okay. So, Your Honor, based upon all 17 of the circumstances I reviewed, what's also in both the 18 earlier Pretrial Services report to inform the Court and the 19 latest one, we believe there is sufficient evidence to be able 2.0 to meet the burden of proof we have to show that he presents 21 both a risk of nonappearance and a risk of danger to people in 22 the community. 23 THE COURT: Okay. I understand the Government's 24 position, Mr. Schiess. 25 MR. SCHIESS: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: 1 Thank you. 2 All right. Ms. Tirinnanzi, you can arque wherever 3 you feel most comfortable. You can come up here if you want 4 or arque --5 MS. TIRINNANZI: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll 6 probably just argue right here because --7 THE COURT: Yeah. That's where usually --8 MS. TIRINNANZI: -- I have made too much of a mess. THE COURT: 9 That's fine. 10 MS. TIRINNANZI: So to begin, Your Honor, we're in a 11 bit of a difficult position with regard to the dropped charge 12 of the assault on a federal officer. Our view of the events 13 that day are very different, and -- however, the case was dismissed, and we never got our preliminary hearing. We never 14 15 got our discovery. So we didn't get to see everything that 16 occurred that day other than the account from my client and 17 family members that were at the home and traumatized from the 18 ordeal when, in our opinion, the FBI clearly violated 19 Mr. Beasley's Fourth Amendment rights when the agents, by 2.0 their own account at the initial appearance for -- you know, 21 13 months ago for that charge, you know, explained that they 22 rang the doorbell but did not wait for consent, and then 23 pushed open the front door, did not announce themselves, and 24 they did not have an arrest or search warrant. And it -- it 25 wasn't -- there were two doors. They came in -- they let

themselves into his home.

2.0

And what Mr. Beasley was doing in his home is up to him. He was traumatized. He's -- the agents were in plain clothes, and he didn't know at what point these individuals would be ascending upon his home. Now, he also pled for four hours to get EMTs while, instead, there was a crisis negotiator just, you know, trying to get information. And Mr. Beasley is desperate. He's bleeding out in the entryway of his home. So I don't know what he was expected to do. He -- he said all kinds of things because he thought he was about to die.

And, you know, the Government represented that he was barricaded, but, you know, he was in a puddle of his own blood. He was the one that was shot that day, not the FBI. So how -- how -- how is someone that's been shot able to barricade themselves? He was laying on the floor begging for medical assistance for four hours. He still has the bullet holes in him -- the bullets inside of him to this day from that occurrence.

Now, those charges were dropped. And if you have more questions, then we could get into that. But I would like to focus on some of the factors that really show that Mr. Beasley is in a different place, a completely different place right now after being held for 13 months when the assault on the federal officer charges were dropped the same

day as his initial appearance for the Ponzi scheme.

2.0

The law requires you to consider the 3142(g) factors in determining whether there are conditions of release that will reasonably assure that my client won't flee and that he will not be a danger to society. We are very pleased that Pretrial Services agrees with us. For instance, we have Mr. Beasley's parents here today, Wayne and Violet. They're right there.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MS. TIRINNANZI: And they have agreed for Mr. Beasley to come reside with them at their home in Las Vegas.

Mr. Beasley is tied to Las Vegas. He's been here since 2004 when he moved here from the Midwest. And he has family here.

He has his sons here who he hasn't been able to see because he's been detained for 13 months. His ex-wife is here. And also, a huge -- a huge development in Mr. Beasley's life -- and also his life outlook -- is that he is expecting the birth of his grandson any day now. And that has really reframed the way that he looks at life and the ability to reconnect, you know, if the children -- when the child's born, you know, with his older son and the minor sons, if, you know, the wife permits it, those are -- those are huge things for

Mr. Beasley. He has significant ties to this community.

Additionally, he is needed in the home of Wayne and

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
Amber McClane, RPR, CRR, CCR #914

Violet because Wayne is still employed. And Violet lives --

2.0

TRANSCRIBED FROM DIGITAL RECORDING 2:23-cr-00066-JAD-DJA • 4/7/2023

you know, she's a breast cancer survivor, and the -- the toll of the cancer that -- you know, she's in remission right now, but the toll of the cancer on her body was tremendous. In addition, she has degenerative disc disease disorder, and she can barely stand for more than 30 seconds at a time. She -- she was here today by -- by using a wheelchair, but, you know, Wayne is -- you know, he's still working. He hasn't been able to retire yet. And having help around the home would be huge for Violet's quality of life and also giving Matt meaning and duty and something to live for.

Additionally, we have secured a job offer which Pretrial Services has confirmed with a construction company here in Las Vegas. It would be salaried and also offers the chance of health insurance after 90 days of probation, which is -- is massive because Mr. Beasley still -- he has -- I have the records from Nevada Southern Detention Center. He has neuropathy in his arm where he was shot, and that requires ongoing treatment and also eventually he would need to see a specialist to have the bullets remove -- removed. So, yes, having the health insurance from that employment would also be helpful to Mr. Beasley and be less of a burden on the detention center.

In addition to the employment being verified, I have a declaration from the receiver -- the receiver, Geoff Winkler, as to his position on how Mr. Beasley has assisted

with -- with cooperating in the SEC case. If you -- if you 1 would like to see it, I can show it you. 2 THE COURT: Has the Government seen it? 3 4 MS. TIRINNANZI: I have a copy for the Government as 5 well. It's very short. 6 THE COURT: Well, I don't know, Mr. Schiess? 7 MR. SCHIESS: I mean, certainly I can see it. 8 THE COURT: All right. Why don't you show it to the 9 Government. 10 MR. SCHIESS: She had an opportunity to give it to us 11 before the hearing. 12 THE COURT: Yeah. See if he has any objection. I --13 I do prefer that you, you know, don't spring things here in the middle of the hearing, but take a minute. Let him look at 14 15 it. 16 MS. TIRINNANZI: Okay. I mean, if you -- if 17 you're -- if it's -- if it's of interest in making your 18 determination, I believe it does have relevance due to the 19 fact that there are no funds for Mr. Beasley to flee on. 2.0 Now, there are other unindicted parties that, you 21 know, these funds may -- I don't know if -- if that -- if they 22 can be attributed to them. But thus far Mr. Winkler, the 23 receiver, is pleased with Mr. Beasley's cooperation as to his 24 own assets and also those of other involved third parties. 25 THE COURT: Okay. Well, you can just make that as a

proffer then. You don't need to give it to me. You don't
need to give it to him. Just proffering that, that's the
way --

MS. TIRINNANZI: Okay.

2.0

THE COURT: -- we do things on this. Okay. Go.

MS. TIRINNANZI: Sure. And then in addition there -there -- I believe you probably already are aware, but there
is an asset freeze and a preliminary injunction. And that's
been in place in the SEC case since April of 2022. So we
don't know how else Mr. Beasley would have access to funds to
flee if there's -- you know, there's been that action taken
almost a year ago, and the receiver is again saying how
pleased he is with Mr. Beasley's cooperation.

And the -- the declaration also explains that

Mr. Beasley is -- is planning to meet with Mr. Winkler later

this month to follow up on other issues. Being detained has

inhibited his ability to potentially make sure that, you know,

everything is -- has been turned over, but he has done -- and

as the declaration says -- he has done that to the best of his

ability given -- given his circumstances.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. TIRINNANZI: Additionally, this was also already filed so everyone -- the Government is already familiar with it. But there was a report produced in the assault on a federal officer case stating by Joseph McEllistrem that

Mr. Beasley is not at suicide risk, and --1 2 THE COURT: Do you have -- do you have a docket number for that? 3 4 MS. TIRINNANZI: Sure. It's Docket Number 12-1. 5 THE COURT: Hold on there. So 12 is the motion to 6 reopen detention hearing. 7 MS. TIRINNANZI: And one -- it was attached as an 8 exhibit. THE COURT: Got it. I'm pulling it up. I hadn't 9 10 seen -- you know, I didn't go back over the other case. Okay. 11 So you're saying that this -- you've seen this 12 before, Mr. Schiess? 13 MR. SCHIESS: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. 14 15 MS. TIRINNANZI: So Mr. Beasley was not put on any 16 suicide precautions at the facility, and 13 months later he is 17 still alive. And the doctor who... excuse me. 18 THE COURT: I'm trying to -- this is a long report. MS. TIRINNANZI: He's a forensic director of health 19 2.0 services for Carson City and Douglas County Sheriff's 21 Department and addresses suicide risk routinely for 22 facilities, justice and municipal courts, and the district 23 courts, and has established suicide prevention procedures in 24 both jail facilities. And he made the finding that 25 Mr. Beasley is absolutely not at risk for suicide.

1	MUE COURT. Well it care the last management save
1	THE COURT: Well, it says the last paragraph says,
2	in summary, based on his history and current psychological
3	presentation when was this done?
4	MS. TIRINNANZI: The date on the evaluation is was
5	March 24th, 2022.
6	THE COURT: So that was a year ago.
7	MS. TIRINNANZI: And the date of report was April
8	2nd, 2022. That was following the ordeal when the FBI let
9	themselves into Mr. Beasley's home.
10	THE COURT: There's no eminent risk of suicide,
11	that's your point.
12	MS. TIRINNANZI: Yes, that's correct.
13	THE COURT: I got it. Okay.
14	MS. TIRINNANZI: Do you have any questions at this
15	time, Your Honor?
16	THE COURT: Oh, no. No. That's fine. I think I
17	understand your position.
18	Let me hear from the Government.
19	MS. TIRINNANZI: Okay. Thank you.
20	THE COURT: Rebuttal?
21	MR. SCHIESS: Certainly.
22	Your Honor, with respect to the doctor suicide
23	report, that was presented to Judge Youchah, and she denied
24	his motion to be released, motion to reconsider. And I
25	pointed out in the Government's response, which was ECF 16,

2.0

TRANSCRIBED FROM DIGITAL RECORDING 2:23-cr-00066-JAD-DJA • 4/7/2023

that the doctor's assessment did not include all the considerations that he said based on his own studies can have a negative impact on a person such as death in the family or divorce. The defendant's wife divorced him within days after the standoff, and the doctor had access to that information, didn't include it, and other factors, and the -- Judge Youchah wasn't persuaded by it. And I don't -- the Court shouldn't either.

Now, Ms. Tirinnanzi tells the Court that in the beginning the FBI possibly violated the Fourth Amendment rights by pushing through an open door. That is not true. And I will tell you that she has sufficient -- or she has information, access to it at least. What happened is Mr. Beasley has a luxury house. He has an outer gate, one of those half fences, half gates. They went through that, and then went to knock on the door. Okay? This was not pushing in a door.

Mr. Beasley was the only person home at the time. His wife wasn't there. His kids weren't there. Everybody was gone.

She raises the inference and said that he didn't know it was the FBI coming. Well, let me tell you this. About two weeks ago Ms. Tirinnanzi asked to come to my office before the scheduled preliminary hearing for the FO charge. I met with her and with her assistant, Michael Harrison, who is a

mitigation specialist, and Mr. Schmale. At that time I told 1 2 her that we would not be going forward on the FO charge. But 3 nonetheless, I gave her a copy of the transcript of the crisis 4 negotiator conversation that lasted over the four hours. 5 Isn't that correct, that I gave that to you? THE COURT: You don't have to --6 7 MR. SCHIESS: Okay. Now, in that --8 THE COURT: Hold on, Mr. Schiess. 9 MR. SCHIESS: Yes, sir. 10 THE COURT: You do not ask another counsel a question on the record in front of me. 11 12 MR. SCHIESS: Yes, sir. THE COURT: Go sit down. 13 14 MR. SCHIESS: I apologize for that. 15 THE COURT: Sit down. 16 MR. SCHIESS: May I continue from here? 17 THE COURT: No. Just be quiet for a minute. 18 MR. SCHIESS: Okay. 19 THE COURT: I get your point that you -- you had a 2.0 meeting with her. Why -- why are you bringing this meeting 21 up? 22 MR. SCHIESS: Because she represented to the Court 23 that he was begging for medical assistance in the house, and I 24 gave her the transcript then. The transcript shows that he 25 was doing the exact opposite. The negotiator was trying to

get him medical assistance. He was not [indiscernible] it. 1 2 THE COURT: Oh --MR. SCHIESS: He admitted that he knew --3 4 THE COURT: I -- you don't -- you don't need to go 5 there. I -- you know, I'm trying to make a very important 6 decision that affects this man's life, and I don't want this 7 thing to degenerate into two lawyers arguing with each other 8 and trying to flex their muscles here in front of me and think 9 that's going to... if you can't control yourself, Mr. Schiess, 10 you can leave, and Mr. Schmale can finish this up. Is that 11 what you want to do? 12 MR. SCHIESS: No, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Okay. Then you just sit there and be 14 quiet and don't speak again unless you stand up, and don't 15 stand up until I tell you you can. 16 I'm trying to decide a very important question here 17 for this gentleman who's presumed innocent about whether he's 18 going to stay in custody or be released pending his -- his 19 trial. The Bail Reform Act puts a heavy burden on me to 2.0 release if I can find a way, and the test isn't is he a risk 21 of flight or a danger to the community. He clearly is. 22 test is whether I can fashion conditions so it's safe to let 23 him go, as safe as I can be. I can't predict the future. And 24 that we can assure he'll show up. 25 And so when I try to figure that out -- and I'll

explain why I'm doing it, whatever I decide -- I haven't 1 2 decided yet. But I do not want this to turn into some contest 3 where you're impeaching the other counsel. If you want to say 4 you proffer that what she says is not there, fine. And move 5 on. 6 Okay. You can come back up to the podium. 7 MR. SCHIESS: My apologies for my approach and my 8 behavior. I apologize, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead. 9 10 MR. SCHIESS: I -- I was -- I'm simply trying to make 11 a record that to the extent the Court may rely upon a 12 representation about Mr. Beasley's state of mind on March the 13 4th when the FBI came there, the transcript says something 14 different about his state of mind, and that was -- been 15 provided and accessible. 16 THE COURT: Okay. So you've reviewed the transcript. 17 You're telling me that, you know, what was represented by 18 counsel is not consistent with the transcript, and you believe 19 what you told me at the beginning was a more accurate 2.0 representation of his state of mind at the time? 21 MR. SCHIESS: Yes. 22 THE COURT: I got it. 23 MR. SCHIESS: And --2.4 THE COURT: What's the next point? 25 MR. SCHIESS: Next time I will be far more careful

with my emotions and responding to something of that nature. 1 2 I apologize. And I apologize to Ms. Tirinnanzi for addressing her in that fashion. 3 4 THE COURT: All right. That's fine. 5 MR. SCHIESS: In terms of then our -- the totality of 6 all the circumstances, the concern that we have is the factors 7 that drove his state of mind and the circumstances that drove 8 his state of mind in March of 2022 are still existing today. 9 Nothing has really changed to drive -- to affect those factors 10 and circumstances. 11 THE COURT: Okay. I understand --12 MR. SCHIESS: Thank you. 13 THE COURT: -- your position. Thank you. 14 MS. TIRINNANZI: Your Honor, if I may? 15 THE COURT: Very briefly. You know, the --16 MS. TIRINNANZI: Very briefly. I'm sorry to waste 17 everyone else's time. 18 THE COURT: No, no --MS. TIRINNANZI: And mister --19 2.0 THE COURT: Let -- wait. Hold on. Hold on just a 21 second. Okay. 22 The Government has the burden. I let them go first. 23 You get a chance to respond. They get the last word because they have the burden of showing me by a preponderance of the 24 25 evidence that no condition or combination of conditions

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

TRANSCRIBED FROM DIGITAL RECORDING 2:23-cr-00066-JAD-DJA • 4/7/2023

reasonably assure your client's appearance, and by clear and convincing evidence that similarly will protect other persons of the community. So if you bring things up, I'm going to hear from Mr. Schiess on it. And I'm -- and this is going to be the very last time because that was your chance before. But go ahead. What do you have that you think I didn't get? MS. TIRINNANZI: I just wanted to add that Mr. Beasley has never owned a passport, and he's never left the country. He's almost afraid to leave the country after a Dateline special he saw about 20 years about something that happened to someone traumatic when they were traveling. So he is very rooted here, and he has no -- he's never had a passport and never obtained one. And then, additionally, I'm sure Your Honor is already aware, but I do have a list of other white-collar offenders in amounts similar to Mr. Beasley's and also much greater that have been granted pretrial release if you would like to hear them? THE COURT: No, I would not. MS. TIRINNANZI: But I think that you probably already are aware. THE COURT: Well, not only that, but this decision on release -- you can't say categorically, because all these

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
Amber McClane, RPR, CRR, CCR #914

people are handled one way, this defendant should be handled a

different way. These are very fact-intensive decisions --1 2 MS. TIRINNANZI: Oh --3 THE COURT: -- and they're --4 MS. TIRINNANZI: -- certainly. 5 THE COURT: -- monument -- you know, what -- what 6 happened to somebody else is of no relevance to my considering 7 this. 8 MS. TIRINNANZI: Certainly. I agree. Just -- sure. 9 Yes, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 11 MS. TIRINNANZI: Thank you. 12 THE COURT: Do you have anything more to add, 13 mister --14 MR. SCHIESS: No, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Oh. Okay. So, you know, the -- the four 16 factors I'm supposed to consider, Number 1 is the nature and 17 circumstance of the offense. Now, this is a very serious 18 offense. Five counts of wire fraud, three counts of money 19 laundering, which, you know, the Government has tailored and 2.0 put their case in a way that can proceed under the law. The 21 evidence about, you know, the amounts of money, the people 22 involved, it's a very, very serious case. The weight of the 23 evidence is apparently very strong. That weighs in favor of 24 detention, but it's the least important factor for the Court 25 to consider under Ninth Circuit precedent, again, because of

presumption of innocence.

2.0

At the time of the offense, the defendant was not subject to conditions of release. Clearly he's never had any other criminal enter -- interaction with the criminal justice system. Nothing in his record.

So now we look at the history and characteristics of the defendant. Strong personal ties to the community. He has a place to live. His law license has been suspended, but, you know, he and his family made plans for him to have -- have employment and try to be able to live a life while this case is pending. That's something that's encouraged by the Bail Reform Act. No criminal history.

But then we get to the armed confrontation with the federal agents, and, you know, to me, why I'm trying to wrestle with this a little bit, this reminds me -- and I hope the -- you know, nobody here takes it the wrong way, but, you know, in Federal Court we have to deal with these child pornography cases that come along, and a lot of the times the defendant is a -- usually male -- almost always, I guess -- who's had a full career in the family, he's a pillar to the community, he's never had any interaction with law enforcement, and things of that nature. And now all of the sudden he's facing years in prison, a serious, humiliating charge, and things like that. We have had defendants in my time here commit suicide that are defendants in child

pornography cases.

2.0

Interestingly, the statute doesn't talk about danger to himself. It's danger to other persons who are in the community. I've wrestled with that. You do worry if someone, you know, just loses -- loses it because of what they're facing and they try to take their life. They could hurt other people, you know. It's something I really worry about.

So -- so -- but this is a unique case here because this defendant was charged with a different crime, and he's been in custody for a year. And, you know, so I'm really wrestling with the time that he spent in custody. He's now aware of where his life is. Has he seen now that the -- the way to go for himself, for his family, is to accept it, deal with what the system has to hand out to him, and try to make the best he can? Is he in a -- in a frame of mind that's different from when the whole house of cards was coming down on him and the agents were in front of his house and -- and, you know, obviously he -- he lost it?

And so, you know, the Government argues persuasively nothing's really changed. He's a very -- risk of doing something out of line and to hurt other people in the community or, you know, fleeing, I think that's hard to imagine he would, but if he tried to, most people don't have much luck doing that in my experience. I can't imagine you would.

2.0

TRANSCRIBED FROM DIGITAL RECORDING 2:23-cr-00066-JAD-DJA • 4/7/2023

So, you know, I -- I just don't know. I'm having a very hard time with this, but I -- I think I have to go and -- and give Mr. Beasley a chance to show that he can fit into the system.

I've got to tell you, sir, you're going to be under supervision. You have to work with these Pretrial Services officers. You know, you're used to -- a lawyer, used to making decisions. Don't make decisions. If you have a question in your mind is this going to be in compliance or is this going to be a problem, check with your lawyer, check with the Pretrial Services officers. And you have to stick to these.

Okay. So based on all those, I do conclude that conditions can be fashioned to protect other persons of the community and also to ensure his appearance. And I'm particularly persuaded because with the support from the family and, you know, maybe I will address this other thing. You know, I -- I know your mom needs help or whatever. That's usually not something that persuades me. You know, I mean, I'm -- I like people to have help when they need it, but the point is I -- that might be another factor for you to get with the program and help your mom stay with your family, work, and work your way through this. I mean, life will go on once this is over. All right?

So I'm going to order him be released, a personal

recognizance bond. Sorry.

2.0

Defendant shall report to Pretrial Services for supervision, abide by the following restrictions on personal association, place of abode, and travel. Travel is restricted to Clark County, Nevada. The defendant shall maintain his residence at 2213 Paseo Court, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89117 and may not move prior to obtaining permission from the Court, Pretrial Services, or supervising officer.

Maintain and actively seek lawful, verifiable employment. Notify Pretrial Services or supervising officer of any change.

Avoid any contact directly or indirectly with any person who is or may become a victim or potential witness in the investigation, including but not limited to -- and the Government will need to provide a list of who he cannot contact.

Refrain from possessing a firearm, destructive device, other dangerous weapon.

Submit to mental health evaluation as directed by Pretrial Services or supervising officer. Participate in mental health treatment as directed. Pay for the cost of the medical or psychiatric treatment based on ability to pay.

Wait. Does that say medical or psychiatric? That should be mental health or psychiatric treatment; right? I mean, we don't offer him medical treatment as part of release.

PRETRIAL SERVICES OFFICER: No, Your Honor, but that 1 2 is the way that the condition is written on the bond, as 3 medical or psychiatric treatment. 4 THE COURT: Okay. Ability to pay. And then 5 defendant shall not solicit monies from investors and not --6 and shall disclose financial information as directed by 7 Pretrial Services or supervising officer. 8 That's pretty important. Work with your lawyer on 9 that, and you -- it's been represented you're going to be 10 cooperating with the receiver. You know what? Would you -- I 11 think maybe we put a condition in there that he cooperate with 12 the receiver in -- in -- in collecting the various information 13 so the property can be returned. So let's add that as --14 cooperating with the receiver in the related civil action. 15 Okay. Anything else to come before the Court? 16 MR. SCHIESS: Yes, Your Honor. Your Honor, may we 17 impose upon the Court to stay this for a few minutes? We want 18 to consult with our office to see if they feel it would be 19 appropriate if we would come back and ask the Court for a stay 2.0 pending appeal. 21 THE COURT: Okay. Pending going up to --22 MR. SCHIESS: We just need a few minutes, please. 23 THE COURT: -- Judge Dorsey. Yeah, I -- I don't know 24 if you know, Judge Navarro just entered an order in another 25 case about -- about that I guess.

1	MR. SCHIESS: I'm not familiar with it.
2	THE COURT: Yeah. It was interesting. I I just
3	read it. Because the public defender was arguing that there's
4	nothing in the Bail Reform Act that allows the magistrate
5	judge to stay his decision, and they were trying to get
6	release while, you know, it was being battled out. It's
7	gosh, I can't remember who the defendant is.
8	But anyway, no, I I think that's what I'm going
9	to do is we can hold the defendant here. Can you hold him up
10	here? And I've got to go ahead, I got a lot I've got five
11	more people to do. Why don't you come back once we're done?
12	MR. SCHIESS: Thank you very much.
13	THE COURT: You can let me know, ask for a stay or
14	not.
15	MR. SCHIESS: Thank you.
16	THE COURT: Okay. All right. Do you have any
17	objection to that, Ms. Tirinnanzi?
18	MS. TIRINNANZI: No, Your Honor.
19	THE COURT: Okay. Good. Let's do that.
20	MS. TIRINNANZI: Thank you, Your Honor.
21	COURTROOM ADMINISTRATOR: All rise.
22	(Pause, 3:48 p.m., until 4:21 p.m.)
23	COURTROOM ADMINISTRATOR: We're now recalling United
24	States of America versus Matthew Wade Beasley, Case Number
25	2:23-cr-66-JAD-DJA.

1 Please enter your appearance for the record beginning 2 with the Government. MR. SCHIESS: Daniel Schiess for the United States. 3 4 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Schiess. 5 MS. TIRINNANZI: Jacqueline Tirinnanzi for Matt 6 Beaslev. 7 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Tirinnanzi. 8 The record will reflect that Mr. Beasley's here. What -- what have you decided, Mr. Schiess? 9 10 MR. SCHIESS: Your Honor, the Government would like 11 to go forward with asking the Court to stay its order pending 12 appeal. What we would like to do -- given now it's late 13 Friday night, we would like to have the Court stay until Monday at 5:00. That would give us time over the Easter 14 15 weekend to be able to prepare the written motion to appeal 16 before the judge. 17 THE COURT: All right. Let's see. On -- on the 18 marshals, if we keep it open till 5:00, then he couldn't be 19 released till Tuesday morning then; is that right? If you get 2.0 notice at 5:00, that would be too late to release him? 21 THE MARSHAL: That sounds [indiscernible] but I can 22 check with my supervisor right now, Your Honor. 23 **THE COURT:** How -- why don't we make it 3:00? 2.4 MR. SCHIESS: Okay. So that way -- I'm sure if we can notify 25 THE COURT:

the -- by 3:00, then you can release him tomorrow -- Monday, and that will give you enough time. So -- but I'll hear from Ms. Tirinnanzi of course before I --

MS. TIRINNANZI: Thank you, Your Honor.

I mean, we oppose the request, and we stand by your decision that there are conditions that can be fashioned and that he will be able to follow the conditions. So we stand by that decision, and also in light of the fact that it's Easter weekend, it would be fantastic for this defendant to be able to spend it with his parents. And also given the fact that he's been detained the past 13 months, we're -- we're very eager for him to be released.

THE COURT: Okay.

2.0

MS. TIRINNANZI: So we -- we oppose the Government's
request. Thank you.

THE COURT: I understand. You know, I -- I -- I sympathize with all that, but I think, you know, the orderly process here -- this was -- it's a close call. I think I explained my decision on this on the record, but the Government does have a right to go up on it. And rather than, you know -- I mean, as a practical matter, they can be calling Judge Dorsey at home or something if they want. There's just no need to do that. I think it's fair to give them until 3:00 o'clock on Monday to get that in.

Now, if they -- if you decide not to do it, you know,

1	please please let Tirinnanzi Ms. Tirinnanzi knows so
2	that then she you can contact the marshals and let him get
3	going on Monday. Okay?
4	MR. SCHIESS: Yes, Your Honor.
5	THE COURT: Okay. But if you get it filed by by
6	3:00 o'clock, then you'll have to stay temporarily
7	detention will continue until Judge Dorsey can review my
8	decision.
9	MS. TIRINNANZI: Thank you, Your Honor.
10	THE COURT: Thank you.
11	(Proceedings adjourned at 4:24 p.m.)
12	* * *
13	I, AMBER M. McCLANE, court-appointed transcriber, certify
14	that the foregoing is a correct transcript transcribed from
15	the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in
16	the above-entitled matter.
17	
18	/s/ Imber M. McClane 4/18/2023 AMBER MCCLANE, RPR, CRR, CCR #914 Date
19	AMBER MCCLANE, RPR, CRR, CCR #914 Date
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	